

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 22 were pending in this application. The present Amendment proposes to amend claim 1 and add new claims 23 through 25. The Examiner is thanked for in the present Action withdrawing the previous Section 101 rejection.

Bases for submission of Amendment after final

Claim 1 is proposed for amendment to correct an antecedent wording issue and with language consistent with other already-examined independent claims 12 and 21. Particularly, the subparagraph proposed for amendment in claim 1 now properly recites that the output data signal relating to the "at least two pixels" is in response to the third subparagraph of claim 1. In other words, note from the third subparagraph of claim 1 that it is the *"portion of said error word for each pixel in said first group"* that is propagated to the "at least two pixels in a next row of pixels." Thus, the next-to-last subparagraph in claim 1 is proposed for amendment to be consistent with that that third subparagraph, that is, so that the output data signal for causing a display corresponding to the at least two pixels is in response to *"said portion of said error word for a pixel in said first group."* Thus, the propagated portion from the third subparagraph is now properly also reflected in the next-to-last paragraph, which before the proposed amendment referenced "said first portion," which instead in claim 1 relates to "said last pixel" instead of "each pixel in said first group." Similar recitations may be seen in claims 12 and 21 which already have been presented and Examined, so Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendment to claim 1 does not introduce new matter nor necessitate any additional consideration beyond that which the Examiner has already kindly given to the comparable language in claims 12 and 21.

New dependent claims 23 through 25 are added based on the Examiner's new explanation of a previous rejection. Particularly, the Examiner in the immediately preceding Action, dated October 16, 2006, on page 5 addressed his rejection of the first subparagraph of claim 1, and stated:

- simultaneously processing image data for at least two pixels (figure 5(100,500 associated pixels) of Nguyen) in a row of pixels (figure 5(510) of Nguyen), said at least two pixels comprising a first group of pixels (figure 5(100 (associated pixels)) of Nguyen) and a last pixel (figure 5(500(associated pixels)) of Nguyen...

In interpreting the Examiner's above statement, Applicant in good faith believed the above language led to the conclusion that the Examiner's position was that he was finding that the "simultaneous processing" he found in Nguyen was that pixel 100 and

pixel 500 were being simultaneously processed. Applicant's previous response, dated April 16, 2007, makes clear that this was Applicant's reading of the Examiner's above explanation. As such, Applicant respectfully submitted that Nguyen pixel 100 and pixel 500 are not simultaneously processed, and in the present Action dated July 12, 2007, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant. However, the Examiner now kindly elaborates and explains on page 3 that he was not suggesting what the Applicant believed in good faith to be the basis of the rejection, where the Applicant's belief was based on the text above. In the Examiner's new present Action explanation, the Examiner states that he finds simultaneous processing "upon one pixel in each segment that corresponds to a filter labeled 100 at each time." Thus, the Examiner now appears to be saying that one pixel in one segment is processed at the same time as another pixel in a different segment. Applicant respectfully submits that it did not (and perhaps could not) comprehend that finding of the Examiner from the previous Action, and therefore until now Applicant could not respond thereto. Accordingly, with the ability to now understand the Examiner's position, Applicant adds dependent claims 23 through 25, depending respectively from independent claims 1, 12, and 21, to recite that the claimed "two pixels" that are simultaneously processed are neighboring pixels. Antecedent support for such an amendment is shown by way of example in Figure 3, wherein the at least two pixels are identified as pixels 302 and 304 in one example, which are clearly neighboring and as also described in the Specification are in adjacent columns.¹

Finally, Applicant also respectfully notes that the Examiner has indicated that the present Action is final because the modifications made to the rejections were "necessitated by the present amendments." However, Applicant respectfully submits that this was not the case. Specifically, the last amendments were made solely to address the Section 101 rejection and not the prior art rejections, and the Examiner was persuaded by those amendments and withdrew that Section 101 rejection. Thus, those amendments did not at all necessitate any "modification to the prior art rejections." Perhaps Applicant's previous Remarks, which are consistent with the above and demonstrate its lack of appreciation of the Examiner's basis for rejection, were what necessitated the modifications to the prior art rejections, and if so (or for some other reason), it was in any event not the Applicant's amendment that caused any need for an additional search or the like and that typically might invite a final rejection. Indeed, the MPEP advises that "b[efore final rejection is in order a clear issue should be developed between the examiner," and Applicant respectfully submits that the "clear issue" of the reasoning behind the Examiner's rejection for the "simultaneous processing" was not a "clear issue"² until now and, hence, Applicant kindly requests at least entry and consideration of the present amendment or the removal of the finality of the present Action.

¹ See, e.g., Specification, page 7, lines 2-3.

² MPEP, 706.07. (This section also states, "[t]he examiner should never lose sight of the fact that in every case the applicant is entitled to a full and fair hearing, and that a clear issue between applicant and examiner should be developed, if possible, before appeal.")

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Various claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and each of those rejections relies first on Nguyen US Patent 6,307,978 (hereafter “Nguyen”). Applicant stands by the two independent bases set forth in its previous response as reasons as to why the rejections under Section 103 should be withdrawn and respectfully requests reconsideration of same, understanding of course that the Examiner has responded thereto in the present Action and thus an appeal may be warranted for a determination as to the correct position as between the Applicant and the Examiner.

Applicant further respectfully submits that each new dependent claim 23 through 25 further narrows the relationship of the simultaneously processed “two pixels” of each of the pending independent claims 1, 12, and 21. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 23 through 25 are in condition for allowance as they render the combinations cited by the Examiner even farther removed from what is recited in claims 23 through 25 since the parallel processing of Nguyen is of pixels in different segments and therefore not “neighboring,” as recited in these dependent claims. Failing a consideration by the Examiner of these claims, then entry thereof is respectfully submitted for purposes of appeal and after the final rejection based on the reasons set forth above, that is, that until the present final rejection Applicant was not well informed of this particular basis of the Examiner’s rejection.

Based on the preceding, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-11, be withdrawn, and Applicant further submits that such claims, as well as new dependent claim 23, are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 12, and its dependent claims 13-20 and new dependent claim 24, be withdrawn, and Applicant further submits that such claims are in condition for allowance. Lastly, and again for similar reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claim 21, and its dependent claim 22 and new dependent claim 24, be withdrawn, and Applicant further submits that such claims are in condition for allowance.

Fees

With the addition of three dependent claims, a fee for each dependent claim of fifty dollars (\$50.00) is required, for a total fee of one hundred and fifty dollars (\$150.00). The Commissioner is authorized to charge this claim fee, and any other fees necessary to effect the present filing, to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowability be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen L. Levine/

Stephen L. Levine
Registry No. 33,413

Anderson, Levine & Lintel, L.L.P.
14785 Preston Road, Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
(972) 664-9552
September 12, 2007

